



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/844,925	04/26/2001	Richard Mark Levenberg	PALM-3542.US.P	8281
49637 7590 01/05/2009 BERRY & ASSOCIATES P.C. 9255 SUNSET BOULEVARD SUITE 810 LOS ANGELES, CA 90069				
EXAMINER				
SHINGLES, KRISTIE D				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2441				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
01/05/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/844,925

Applicant(s)

LEVENBERG, RICHARD MARK

Examiner

KRISTIE D. SHINGLES

Art Unit

2441

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 October 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
- Paper No./Mail Date: _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Per Applicant's Request for Continued Examination

Claims 1, 4, 9, 13, 18 and 22 have been amended.

Claims 1-22 are pending.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

I. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 10/31/2008 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

II. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 9, 18 and 22 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

III. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

III. Claims 1-6, 8-10, 13-15, 17-19 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Bhagwat et al* (6,563,517) in view of *Horie* (US 7,123,291).

a. **Per claim 1, *Bhagwat et al*** teach a method for transcoding web-page content for a limited-display computing device comprising the steps of:

a) upon receiving a web page request from a limited-display computing device, sending the web page request to a server computer that contains the requested web page document (*col.2 line 47-col.3 line 22, col.5 lines 12-23, col.13 lines 28-58*);

b) receiving from said server computer a web page document that can be used to generate a display (*col.2 line 47-col.3 line 22, col.5 lines 30-50*);

c) searching said web page document for sequences of textual references to images (*col.5 lines 24-29, col.5 line 47-col.6 line 4*);

d) when said web page document includes more than one textual references to images, rendering each of the images represented by said textual references to generate a composite image (*col.6 lines 19-65, col.7 lines 1-62 col.12 line 13-col.13 line 10—webpage includes references for images*);

e) scaling each composite image rendered in step d) to meet the display requirements of said limited-display computing device (*col.3 lines 39-50, col.5 lines 19-59, col.6 lines 26-65, col.7 lines 24-41—provision for scaling images to meet the display requirements and capabilities of the client device*); and

f) sending each composite image scaled in step e) to said limited-display computing device (*col.4 lines 55-67, col.5 lines 12-23—sending scaled images to limited-display client devices*).

Although *Bhagwat et al* teach transcoding policies for streaming images and image segments based on the capabilities of the requesting client device, wherein an image transcoder waits to accumulate an entire input image before transcoding (*col.7 lines 15-24 and*

57-62, *col.12 line 13-col.13 line 10*); yet *Bhagwat et al* fail to explicitly teach searching said web page document for sequences of textual references directly adjoining each other, said textual reference refer to images when said web page document includes more than one textual reference directly adjoining each other. However, *Horie* teaches horizontally and vertically adjoining text references when combining images (*col.5 lines 29-42, col.7 lines 33-50, col.13 lines 14-50, col.15 lines 58-64, col.16 lines 13-17, col.17 lines 4-55*).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of *Bhagwat et al* with *Horie* for the purpose of transcoding and conceptually linking directly-adjoining images from a webpage so as to generate a transcoded composite image with adjoining references; because this allows for the transcoding of an entire image segments in order to properly render the composite image on the limited-display device while also permitting the organization and aggregation of web images by enabling conceptual linking of image references for synthesizing and transcoding images.

b. **Per claim 2**, *Bhagwat et al* with *Horie* teach the method of Claim 1, *Bhagwat et al* further teach wherein said web page document is written in a Hypertext Markup Language (HTML) (*col.1 lines 52-58, col.3 lines 9-13, col.4 lines 60-63*).

c. **Per claim 3**, *Bhagwat et al* with *Horie* teach the limitation of claim 2, *Horie* further teaches wherein said more than one textual reference to images are directly adjoining vertically (*col.5 lines 29-67*).

d. **Per claim 4**, *Bhagwat et al* with *Horie* teach the method of Claim 1, *Horie* further teaches wherein step d) further comprises: d1) when said web page document includes a formatting object that includes a plurality of the textual references, rendering each of the images

represented by a textual references to an image that is disposed in said formatting object so as to generate a composite image (*col.5 line 29-col.6 line 35, col.2 lines 41-60, col.1 line 60-col.2 line 29; Bhagwat et al: col.5 lines 47-48*).

e. **Claims 9, 18 and 22** contain limitations substantially equivalent to the limitations of claims 1 and 4, and therefore are rejected under the same basis.

f. **Claims 10 and 19** contain limitations substantially similar to the limitations of claim 2, and therefore are rejected under the same basis.

g. **Per claim 5**, *Bhagwat et al* with *Horie* teach the method as recited in Claim 1, *Bhagwat et al* further teach wherein step e) further includes reducing the bit depth of said composite image to meet the display requirements of said limited-display computing device (*col.5 lines 45-50 and 57-62, col.6 lines 39-65, col.7 lines 1-41*).

h. **Claim 14** contains limitations substantially similar to the limitations of claim 5, and therefore is rejected under the same basis.

i. **Per claim 6**, *Bhagwat et al* with *Horie* teach the method as recited in Claim 1, *Bhagwat et al* further teach wherein said images rendered in step d) are rendered to an image size corresponding to the image size of a full-size display screen (*col.5 lines 19-23 and 39-50, col.6 lines 29-65, col.12 lines 2-6*).

j. **Claim 15** contains limitations substantially similar to the limitations of claim 6, and therefore is rejected under the same basis.

k. **Per claim 8**, *Bhagwat et al* with *Horie* teach the method as described in Claim 1, *Bhagwat et al* further teach wherein said limited-display computing device is selected from the

group consisting of handheld computing device, a mobile phone, a pager, and an Internet appliance (*col.1 lines 43-45, col.2 lines 62-67*).

l. **Claim 17** contains limitations substantially similar to the limitations of claim 8, and therefore is rejected under the same basis.

m. **Per claim 13**, *Bhagwat et al* with *Horie* teach the method of claim 9 wherein step d) further comprises: *Horie* further teaches d1) when said web page document includes a sequence of textual references to images that are directly adjoining, rendering each of the images represented by said textual references that are directly adjoining so as to generate a composite image (*col.5 line 29-col.6 line 35, col.2 lines 41-60, col.1 line 60-col.2 line 29; Bhagwat et al: col.7 lines 15-24 and 57-62, col.12 line 13-col.13 line 10*).

IV. Claims 11 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Bhagwat et al* (6,563,517) in view of *Horie* (US 7,123,291) further in view of *Hawkins* (US 2001/0032254).

Per claims 11 and 20, *Bhagwat et al* with *Katayama et al* teach the limitations claims 10 and 19 as applied above, but fail to teach the method of claims 10 and 19 wherein said formatting object is a table. However, *Hawkins* teaches the use of a table (*paragraph 0115 and TagTable, pages 20-21*). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the systems of *Bhagwat et al* and *Horie* with *Hawkins* in order to provide for the conversion processing, scaling, and rendering of formatting objects such as tables, for the purpose of extending the method's capabilities to other types of formats supported by web pages and not just text only. One skilled in the art would have been motivated to generate the claimed invention with a reasonable expectation of success.

V. Claims 7, 12, 16 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bhagwat et al (6,563,517) in view of Horie (US 7,123,291) further in view of Robotham et al (US 6,704,024).

a. **Per claim 7**, *Bhagwat et al* with *Horie* teach the limitations of claim 6 as applied above, *Bhagwat et al* teach applying the transcoding policies to text of a webpage (*col.6 lines 19-20*) but fail to explicitly teach the method as recited in Claim 6 wherein all of said web page document except said images rendered in step d) are transcoded using a normal transcoding process and are sent in step f) to said limited-display computing device. However, *Robotham et al* teach using a transcoding process as applied only to text (*col.5 lines 1-35*). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of *Bhagwat et al* and *Horie* with *Robotham et al* to transcode web content except for images for the purpose of using other alternative encoding rules that are more efficient for encoding images or transcoding only specific types of web content.

b. **Claim 16** contains limitations substantially similar to the limitations of claim 7, and is therefore rejected under the same basis.

c. **Per claim 12**, *Bhagwat et al* with *Horie* teach the limitations of claim 10 as applied above, but fail to teach the method of Claim 10 wherein said formatting object is a frame. However, *Robotham et al* teach making use of a frame and implementing a frame-buffer (*col.9 lines 4-16 and col.19 lines 37-60*). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of *Bhagwat et al* and *Horie* with *Robotham et al* to provide for the conversion processing, scaling, and rendering of formatting objects such as frames, for the purpose of extending the method's capabilities to other types of formats supported by web pages and not just text only.

d. **Claim 21** has limitations substantially similar to the limitations of claim 12, and is therefore rejected under the same basis.

Conclusion

VI. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure: Blumberg (6449639), Crill et al (6445822).

Examiner's Note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the reference(s) applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the Applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the cited passages as taught by the prior art or relied upon by the examiner. Should Applicant amend the claims of the claimed invention, it is respectfully requested that Applicant clearly indicate the portion(s) of Applicant's specification that support the amended claim language for ascertaining the metes and bounds of Applicant's claimed invention.

VII. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kristie D. Shingles whose telephone number is 571-272-3888. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday 8:00am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on 571-272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

Art Unit: 2441

system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kristie D. Shingles
Examiner
Art Unit 2441

/KDS/
/William C. Vaughn, Jr./

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2444